

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 26-47 are now pending in the application. New Claims 31-47 have been added. Claims 1, 6, 9-11, 13, 19-20, and 22 have been amended. Claim 25 is cancelled. Support for amendments and new Claims may be found in the originally filed specification. Amendments to the Claims were made for clarification purposes and are not limiting amendments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

Applicants have amended the specification to fix typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

DRAWINGS

Applicants have amended Figure 2 to fix a typographical error and to include a missing reference numeral.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 13, 16, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hegde (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,875) in view of Yazaki et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0002438). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hegde does not disclose extracting a “private IP address directly from the options field,” as Claim 1 recites. Yazaki et al. do not correct the deficiencies of

Hegde. Yazaki et al. extract a destination IP address from the destination address field of the header. The destination address and source address fields of the packet header are distinct from the options field. In fact, Yazaki et al. do not even show the options field in their partial header of Figure 2. Claims 13, 16, 20, and 22 are in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to Claim 1.

Claims 21 and 23 ultimately depend from Claims 20 and 22, respectively, which Applicants believe to be allowable.

Claims 9-12, 19, and 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stai et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,128) in view of Yazaki et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0002438). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Stai et al. do not disclose directly extracting “at least one private IP address from the options field,” as Claim 9 recites. Yazaki et al. do not correct the deficiencies of Stai et al. for at least reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 19 is in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to Claim 1. Claim 24 recites that “said traversable network address resides in an options field of an IP packet header.” Neither Stai et al. nor Yazaki et al. teach any such use of the IP options field.

Claims 10-12, 25-29, and 30 ultimately depend from Claims 9, 24, and 13, respectively, which Applicants believe to be allowable.

Claims 2-8, 14-15, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hegde (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,875) in view of Stai et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,128). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-8, 14-15, and 17-18 ultimately depend from Claims 1, 13, and 13, respectively, which Applicants believe to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 8, 2005

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs, Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/MRN

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figures 1 and 2, replaces the original sheets including Figures 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet